



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/663,933	09/16/2003	Marc A. Najork	MSFT-2736/305415.01	2335
41505	7590	09/21/2009		
WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP (MICROSOFT CORPORATION) CIRA CENTRE, 12TH FLOOR 2929 ARCH STREET PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104-2891			EXAMINER	
			HICKS, MICHAEL J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2165	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
09/21/2009	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/663,933	Applicant(s) NAJORK, MARC A.
	Examiner Michael J. Hicks	Art Unit 2165

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 June 2009.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-15, 19-24 and 33-40 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-15, 19-24, and 33-40 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-15, 19-24, and 33-40 Pending.

Claims 16-18, and 25-32 Canceled.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-15, 19-24, and 33-40 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-15, 19-24, and 33-40 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bharat et al. (Improved Algorithms for Topic Distillation in a Hyperlinked Environment", Proceedings of the 21st annual international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval, Pages 104-111, ACM, 1998 and referred to hereinafter as Bharat).

As per Claims 1, 19, and 33, Bharat discloses a computing system comprising at least one processor and a memory communicatively coupled to said at least one processor, a method, and a computer readable medium for adjusting a score of a document wherein said score increases in proportion to a number of structurally linked

documents endorsing said document (See Page 105, Section 2.1 and Page 106, Section 3 which clearly disclose that each node (e.g. document) is assigned an authority score which is comprised of a hub score indicative of the number of relevant documents structurally related to the node and an authority weight which is indicative the inverse of the number of other documents of the set which are located on the same host as the node.), comprising: identifying, using said computing system, a Web server defined by at least one of: (A) a server comprising a plurality of Web pages with the same symbolic host name, (B) a server comprising a plurality of Web pages associated with the same domain, and (C) a server having a plurality of Web pages associated with the same IP address (See Page 106, Section 3 which clearly discloses that distinct hosts are identified. Examiner notes that a host may be interpreted as any of a symbolic host name, domain, IP address, or Web server.); determining on said computing system, an adjustment factor in inverse proportion to a number of documents hosted on said Web server (See Page 105, Section 2.1 and Page 106, Section 3 which clearly disclose that each node (e.g. document) is assigned an authority score which is comprised of a hub score indicative of the number of relevant documents structurally related to the node and an authority weight which is indicative the inverse of the number of other documents of the set which are located on the same host as the node.) adjusting said score as a function of said adjustment factor documents, whereby when said number of documents on said Web server increases said score decreases and when said number of documents on said Web server decreases said score increases (See Page 105, Section 2.1 and Page 106, Section 3 which clearly disclose that the hub score is multiplied by the authority weight.); and storing the adjusted score in said memory (See Table 1 which clearly discloses that results are returned to a search engine. Examiner notes that in order for the results to be calculated and returned the authority weight must be stored in memory at some point.).

As per Claims 2 and 34, Bharat discloses assigning the score to the document in proportion to the number of structurally linked documents endorsing said document (See Page 105, Section 2.1 and Page 106, Section 3 which clearly disclose that each node (e.g. document) is assigned an authority score which is comprised of a hub score indicative of the number of relevant documents structurally related to the node and an authority weight which is indicative the inverse of the number of other documents of the set which are located on the same host as the node.).

As per Claims 3 and 35, Bharat discloses assigning the score in proportion to at least one score assigned to at least one of said structurally linked documents endorsing said document (See Page 106, Section 3 which clearly discloses that the Hub Score is based on the sum of the authority scores of structurally linked documents.).

As per Claims 4 and 36, Bharat discloses assigning the score in proportion to (A) the number of structurally linked documents endorsing said document and (B) at least one score assigned to at least one of said structurally linked documents endorsing said document (See Page 105, Section 2.1 and Page 106, Section 3 which clearly disclose that each node (e.g. document) is assigned an authority score which is comprised of a hub score indicative of the number of relevant documents structurally related to the node and an authority weight which is indicative the inverse of the number of other documents of the set which are located on the same host as the node. Examiner notes that the Hub Score is based on the sum of the authority scores of structurally linked documents.).

As per Claims 5 and 37, Bharat discloses assigning the score to the document in inverse proportion to the number of outlinks of at least one of said structurally linked documents endorsing said document (See Page 105, Section 2.1 and Page 106, Section 3 which clearly disclose that each node (e.g. document) is assigned an authority score which is comprised of a hub score indicative of the number of relevant documents structurally related to the node and an authority weight which is indicative the inverse of the number of other documents of the set which are located on the same host as the node. Examiner notes that the Hub Score is based on the authority scores of structurally linked documents.).

As per Claims 6, 22, and 39, Bharat discloses said adjusting includes adjusting the score in inverse proportion to the number of documents located on the same domain as said document (See Page 106, Section 3 which clearly discloses that distinct hosts are identified. Examiner notes that a host may be interpreted as any of a symbolic host name, domain, IP address, or Web server.).

As per Claims 7, 21, and 38, Bharat discloses said adjusting includes adjusting the score to the document in inverse proportion to the number of documents having the same symbolic host name as said document (See Page 106, Section 3 which clearly discloses that distinct hosts are identified. Examiner notes that a host may be interpreted as any of a symbolic host name, domain, IP address, or Web server.).

As per Claims 8, 23, and 40, Bharat discloses said adjusting includes adjusting the score in inverse proportion to the number of documents associated with the same

internet protocol (IP) address as said document (See Page 106, Section 3 which clearly discloses that distinct hosts are identified. Examiner notes that a host may be interpreted as any of a symbolic host name, domain, IP address, or Web server.).

As per Claim 9, Bharat discloses adjusting the score based upon summing the scores of the at least one other document linking to said first document (See Page 106, Section 3 which clearly discloses that the Hub Score is based on the sum of the authority scores of structurally linked documents.).

As per Claims 10 and 24, Bharat discloses the structurally linked documents are Web pages having hyperlinks and the document is a Web page (See the Abstract and Introduction of Bharat which clearly disclose the paper is dealing with the link structure of web pages).

As per Claim 11, Bharat discloses outputting the adjusted score of the document to a component of a Web search service (See Table 1 which clearly discloses that results are returned to a search engine.).

As per Claim 12, Bharat discloses assigning a set of documents scores higher than an average minimum score (See Page 106, Section 4.2 which clearly discloses that the set of documents are assigned a starting score and a minimum threshold based on these scores exists. Examiner notes that at least some of the documents must, by definition, be assigned scores higher than the minimum threshold score.).

As per Claim 13, Bharat discloses the set of documents is based on at least one of Nielsen ratings, ratings assigned by humans, Web page usage patterns extracted from ISP proxy logs, Web page usage patterns extracted from a search engine and documents specified according to a user preference (See Page 105, Section 2.1 which clearly discloses that the initial set is retrieved from a search engine and therefore based on web page usage patterns extracted from a search engine (e.g. a standard web search algorithm).).

As per Claim 14, Bharat discloses altering the adjusted score of the document based upon an additional scoring technique to said adjusted score (See Page 106, Section 4.1 which clearly discloses that additional relevance scoring is used to adjust the document scores.).

As per Claim 15, Bharat discloses comparing the adjusted score against said additional scoring technique to discover anomalous results (See Pages 106-107, Section 4.2 which clearly discloses that the additional relevance scoring is used to prune some results of the initial set.).

As per Claim 20, Bharat discloses the score is calculated inversely proportional to the number of said at least one source document located on the same Web server (See Page 106, Section 3 which clearly discloses that distinct hosts are identified. Examiner notes that a host may be interpreted as any of a symbolic host name, domain, IP address, or Web server.).

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Points of Contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael J. Hicks whose telephone number is (571) 272-2670. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:00a - 5:30p.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Neveen Abel-Jalil can be reached at (571)272-4074. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Michael J Hicks
Art Unit 2165
Phone: (571) 272-2670
Fax: (571) 273-2670

/Neveen Abel-Jalil/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2165